

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-17 and 20-22 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations previously recited in dependent claims 2 and 3, and claims 2 and 3 are cancelled accordingly; claim 8 is amended back to being dependent on claim 1 (claim 1 as presently amended); claim 11 is cancelled as superfluous; and claim 16 is amended to correct a spelling error. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious based on Ahonen, U.S. 4,099,733, in view of Scotese et al., U.S. 2002/0093153. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Initially, Applicant notes that claim 16 was objected to for a spelling error but otherwise was indicated to be allowed. Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, recites apparatus that corresponds to the method recited in claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 should be allowed on that basis.

Moreover, Applicant submits that one of skill in the art would not have been inclined to combine Ahonen and Scotese in the manner put forth by the Examiner – particularly to arrive at all features of the invention as now set forth in claim 1. In particular, the invention is concerned with a coupling between two different halves of a vehicle, i.e., between front and rear sections thereof. Ahonen, on the other hand, is concerned with a rotatable, flexible joint which can be locked in rotated position by the driver but that does not include the advance feature of being responsive to the difference in angular position between the two vehicle sections. Furthermore, Scotese is not at all concerned with a joint between two sections of a vehicle, but rather, with a single-section vehicle with pivotable wheel pairs and a boom arm. Thus, Scotese concerns a quite different type of vehicle in comparison to Ahonen and also seeks to address a different problem of wheel pair tilt and control – not coupling between two sections of a multi-section vehicle. In view of these differences between Ahonen and Scotese, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been inclined to combine their disparate teachings to

obtain the invention recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all remaining claims are in condition for allowance, and timely Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

\*\*\*\*\*

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 7589.146.PCUS00.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner may directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Novak Druce + Quigg LLP  
1000 Louisiana, Fifty-Third Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(713) 571-3400  
(713) 456-2836 (fax)  
tracy.druce@novakdruce.com

Respectfully submitted,  
  
/Tracy W. Druce/  
  
Tracy W. Druce, Esq.  
Reg. No. 35,493